



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

Applicant	Indian Wells Valley Water District	County	Kern
Project Title	Groundwater Quality Characterization for the Indian Wells Valley, California (Basin 6-54)	Grant Request	\$ 247,100.00
		Total Project Cost	\$ 305,100.00

Project Description: The proposed project archives, in a relational database (KCWA), all available groundwater quality data (paper lab analyses from 400 wells), develops a baseline evaluation of groundwater quality of the basin by sampling approximately 200 wells throughout the valley, and develops a groundwater monitoring program to track changes in groundwater quality.

Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	3
Work Plan	6
Budget	2
Schedule	3
QA/QC	4
Past Performance	5
Geographical Balance	0
Total Score	28

- **GWMP or Program:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. The Cooperative Groundwater Management Plan for the Indian Wells Valley was adopted March 15, 2012.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. For example, there is no detailed description of the proposed project, just a list of tasks. The proposed project goals and objectives described in the Project Description are inconsistent with the goals and objectives described in the Work Plan. The applicant includes a list of what present and future water managers will be able to accomplish once a baseline groundwater characterization of the basin is achieved. However, little detail is provided regarding what technical methods will be performed to complete the project. For example, page 11 states that a geochemical fate and transport model will be developed, but it does not state the purpose of the model or what kind of results it will present that will be applicable to this project?
- **Work Plan:** The criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The purpose of the proposed project stated in the Work Plan is identical to what is stated as objectives in the Project Description, which are also stated as tasks. The inconsistency of goals and objectives, tasks, and purpose throughout the proposal make it difficult to understand exactly what the applicant is trying to accomplish with the proposed project. Also, a list of tasks is provided (similar to that of the project description), but with no detail as to how they will be accomplished. The only information provided is who will fund the task and which agency will oversee the work. Much of the sampling work will be done on private property; however, no assurances that Kern County will be able to attain access to these properties are provided. Lastly, the applicant does not adequately address CEQA compliance. It states, no environmental documentation would be needed as this is not a project under CEQA standards, but it does not specify why (i.e., a categorical exemption like “Information Collections”).



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

- **Budget:** The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. Information to support how the budget estimate was developed is not provided. Unit prices (hourly rates) are provided but, labor categories are not, making it unclear as to who will perform the work. The budget is not consistent with the work plan. Subtasks are provided in the budget that are not in the work plan, (e.g., all subtasks provided under Task 5). Cost totals are provided as In-kind and on-going without explanation of what is meant by these classifications. For portions of the budget it is unclear if there is a mathematical error or just a mischaracterization of costs. For example, Task 10 contains two subtasks with an agency cost of \$4,000 each, but the sub-total is \$4,000 rather than \$8,000. The same is noted for Task 11, where two subtasks have agency costs of \$2,000 and \$4,000, respectively (totaling \$6,000) but the bolded sub-total is \$4,000. Also, it is difficult to determine whether the applicant intends to fund half the cost, with the rest funded by the grant. In addition, under the In-Kind Agency column, many of the rows note "ALL", which is unclear.
- **Schedule:** The criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. The schedule is not entirely consistent with the work plan and or budget. For example, under Task 10 it is noted that 6 progress reports will be completed; however, in the work plan a specific number was not given. In the budget, tasks 10.1-10.2 include work associated with data review/interpretation and GIS application, yet this work is not listed in the schedule. The same issue is present for Task 11: Final Report; the data review/interpretation and GIS application tasks are missing from the schedule. Also, missing from this section is how the schedule was derived and an explanation of how obstacles would be resolved to keep the project on schedule.
- **QA/QC:** The criterion is addressed but is not thoroughly documented. A Quality Assurance Manual for Kern County is provided; however, there is no explanation of how the standards or methodologies in this manual relate to specific tasks in the work plan. Personnel qualifications are provided for those working on the project.
- **Past Performance:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. For example, Indian Wells Valley provided information for two grants they have been lead agency on within the last 5 years including back up documentation, such as, a certification of compliance with water metering requirements and a letter from DWR stating the Grantee completed a Pilot Testing project within budget and schedule.